

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

9
10
11
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
14 AT SEATTLE
15

16 MARGARET MABLE,
17 Plaintiff,
18
19 v.
20
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
22 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
23 WASHINGTON, et al.,
24
25 Defendants.
26

27 CASE NO. C13-2329RAJ
28 ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

15 This matter comes before the court on review of the complaint of Plaintiff
16 Margaret Mable. She is proceeding in this case without the assistance of an attorney and
17 in forma pauperis. In a case where a plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, the court “shall
18 dismiss the case” if it determines that the plaintiff’s complaint either “fails to state a
19 claim on which relief may be granted” or “seeks monetary relief against a defendant who
20 is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

21 Ms. Mable complaint names this District Court, the United States District Court
22 for the Central District of California, and two assistant United States attorneys. She
23 claims errors and double jeopardy arising from a criminal prosecution that she never
24 identifies, violation of unspecified civil and constitutional rights, and violation of
25 “FIOA.” (The court assumes that Plaintiff means to invoke the Freedom of Information
26 Act.)
27
28

ORDER – 1

The only factual allegation of her complaint that the court can partially understand is that one or more of the prosecutors used black marker on discovery that she apparently requested. The court has no idea in what case the prosecutors allegedly took these actions. Her complaint, as it currently stands, states no comprehensible allegation of unlawful activity by the prosecutors, and thus no claim on which the court could grant relief. The court notes, moreover, that prosecutors are absolutely immune from civil liability for actions taken in initiating a prosecution and in presenting a case. *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 431 (1976).

The court has no idea why Ms. Mable has named two federal district courts as Defendants. There is no allegation of what the courts have done to her. She states no claim against the courts which the court could grant relief. The court notes also that individual judges of those courts are absolutely immune from civil liability. *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 9 (1991).

Accordingly, the court orders Ms. Mable to show cause why the court should not dismiss this case for both failure to state a claim and failure to name any defendant who is not immune from civil liability. Ms. Mable must respond to this order to show cause by submitting an amended complaint no later than February 7, 2013. That complaint must contain allegations about Mr. Mable that address the concerns the court raised in this order. If Ms. Mable does not respond to this order to show cause, or if her amended complaint does not address all of the issues the court raised in this order, the court will dismiss this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

DATED this 9th day of January, 2014.

Richard D. Jones

The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Court Judge

ORDER – 2